REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the amendments above and following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are non-statutory under 35 USC § 101 or anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102 (e). Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse action in any of the claims now pending in the application, the Examiner can telephone Ms. Janet M. Skafar, Esq. at telephone number (650) 988-0655 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3-14, and 16-24 are pending in this application. Claims 2 and 15 are canceled. Claim 24 is new.

The Rejection of Claim 14 under 35 USC § 101

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being unpatentable because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicants have amended Claim 14 to recite a "computer usable storage medium". Therefore Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 14 is directed to statutory subject matter and request that the rejection of Claim 14 under 35 USC § 101 be withdrawn.

NOTIFICATION OF BROADING OF CLAIMS

Applicants hereby notify the Examiner that Applicants are broadening the claims. Applicants hereby retract all prior arguments in all prior amendments distinguishing the claimed invention from the prior art. Any disclaimer that may have occurred during the prosecution of this patent application is hereby expressly rescinded. Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to reconsider previous rejections and art with respect to the broader claims.

Applicants point out that the following recitations have been deleted from Claim 1: "wherein said binding the virtual table to the message queue specifies a type of read access from the message queue based on the binding-command, the type of read access being a non-destructive read based on the binding-command being a first binding-command, and the type of read access being a destructive read based on the binding-command being a second binding-command different from said first binding-command".

Applicants point out that the following recitations have been deleted from Claim 10: "wherein said binding the virtual table to the message queue specifies a type of read access from the message queue based on the binding-command, the type of read access being a non-destructive read based on the binding-command being a first binding-command, and the type of read access being a destructive read based on the binding-command being a second binding-command different from said first binding-command".

Applicants point out that the following recitations have been deleted from Claim 14: "wherein said binding the virtual table to the message queue specifies a type of read access from the message queue based on the binding-command, the type of read access being a non-destructive read based on the binding-command being a first binding-command, and the type of read access being a destructive read based on the binding-command being a second binding-command different from said first binding-command".

The Rejection of Claims 1-23 under 35 USC § 102 (e)

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 USC § 102 (e) as being unpatentable over the Couch et al publication (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0126109, filed on July 2, 2002). In response, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 10-13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21 to more particularly point out the invention.

Applicants respectfully maintain that the Couch et al publication does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, each and every recitation as claimed. Applicants respectfully maintain that the Couch et al publication does not disclose "receiving a binding-command specifying a virtual table and at least one messaging system configuration parameter; binding the virtual table to a message queue, the virtual table comprising a message-data column and at least one message-attribute column, the at least one message-attribute column comprising a correlation identifier column, wherein said binding comprises associating at least one access routine with the virtual table, the at least one access routine comprises the at least one messaging system command of the messaging system; receiving at least one database command to select data from the virtual table having a particular correlation identifier; and accessing the message queue in accordance with the at least one database command to select data from the virtual table, the message queue having messages comprising message-data and at least one message-attribute data, the at least one message-attribute data comprising a message correlation identifier, the message-data being separate from the message correlation identifier, wherein said accessing invokes the at least one access routine to access the message queue, wherein the at least one access routine builds a messaging system read request of the at least one messaging system command, the messaging system read request specifying the particular correlation identifier to read a message from the message queue, the messaging system read request being executed wherein at least one message of the message queue having a message correlation identifier matching the particular correlation identifier is read, wherein the message-data of the at least one message that is read is provided in the message-data column of the virtual table, and the particular correlation identifier is provided in the correlation identifier column of the virtual table" as claimed.

In the messaging system, the correlation identifier is different from the message data. In MQ Series, the correlation identifier is an attribute of the message descriptor. The " MQSeries Primer" by Dieter Wackerow, on page 6, last full paragraph, which is cited on the IDS submitted on the same date as this patent application, teaches: "The correlation identifier is used to identify a specific request or reply message. The programmer can move a value in one or both fields or have MQSeries create a unique ID for him or her. Before the programmer puts the request message in the queue he or she can save the ID(s) and use them in a subsequent get operation for the reply message. The program that receives the request message copies this information into the reply message. This allows the originating program (the one that gets the reply) to instruct MQSeries to look for a specific message in the queue instead of getting the first one in the queue."

The claimed invention recites: receiving at least one database command to select data from the virtual table having a particular correlation identifier; and accessing the message queue in accordance with the at least one database command to select data from the virtual table, the message queue having messages comprising message-data and at least one message-attribute data, the at least one message-attribute data comprising a message correlation identifier, the message-data being separate from the message correlation identifier, wherein said accessing invokes the at least one access routine to access the message queue, wherein the at least one access routine builds a messaging system read request of the at least one messaging system command, the messaging system read request specifying the particular correlation identifier to read a message from the message queue, the messaging system read request being executed wherein at least one message of the message queue having a message correlation identifier matching the particular correlation identifier is read, wherein the message-data of the at least one message that is read is provided in the message-data column of the virtual table, and the particular correlation identifier is provided in the correlation identifier column of the virtual table. The Couch et al publication has no such teaching.

In the claimed invention, the message-data and message-attribute data are different. The Couch et al publication interfaces a message data string, which is different from the message-attribute data of the claimed invention.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 1 is not anticipated by the Couch et al publication. Claims 3-9, 21-23 depend, either directly or indirectly from Claim 1, and Applicants respectfully maintain that Claims 2-9 and 21-23 are not anticipated by the Couch et al publication for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claims 10 and 14 have similar distinguishing recitations as Claim 1, and Applicants respectfully maintain that Claims 10 and 14 are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1. Claims 11-13 and 16-20 depend from Claims 10 and 14, respectively; Applicants respectfully maintain that Claims 11-13 and 16-20 are patentable for the same reasons as Claims 10 and 14, respectively.

New Claim 24 depends from Claim 1, and Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 24 is patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Conclusion

Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

July 17, 2007

Janet M. Skafar, Attorney
Reg. No. 41,315
Correspondence Customer No. 55070
Telephone: (650)988-0655
Facsimile: (408) 463-4827